

REMARKS

Claims 11-21 are pending in the present Application. Claims 11-21 have been canceled; new claims 22-33 have been added, leaving Claims 22-33 for further consideration upon entry of the present Amendment.

Support for the newly presented Claims 22-33 can at least be found in Figures 1-7, and the corresponding discussion in paragraphs [0018], [0026], [0038], [0050], and [0051] of the specification.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 12-18 and 20-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More particularly, all of these claims depend upon canceled claims.

Claims 12-18 and 20-21 have been canceled. Consequently the rejection is moot and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Previous Claims 11, 12, 19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schroeder (US 2780352).

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the \* \* \* claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Schroeder discloses only narrow lines of adhesive on a roll and accordingly does not disclose that at least 15% of the area of a lateral surface of the roll should be covered with

adhesive. As disclosed in paragraphs [0053] and [0054], by ensuring that the coverage of the lateral surface of the roll is at least about 15% of the area of the lateral surface, applicants are able to not only reinforce the roll so that it has increased resistance to deformation to aid in packaging but also, in the case of coreless rolls, to reduce the risk of crushing of the center hole.

These unexpected advantages are not suggested in Schroeder.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Previous Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schroeder (US 2780352) as applied to claims 11, 12 and 19 above.

Previous Claims 14-15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schroeder (US 2780352) as applied to claims 11-13 and 19 above and further in view of Koizumi et al (US 5474249) or Odagiri (US 5725169).

Previous Claims 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schroeder (US 2780352) in view of Koizumi et al (US 5474249) or Odagiri (US 5725169) as applied to claims 11-15 and 19 above.

As mentioned above, Schroeder only suggests the use of thin lines of adhesive such that “the additional expense involved is not material” (col. 2, ll. 66-67). In an industry in which a few cents in a twenty dollar case is more than material, as it can make the difference between a viable product and a non-viable product, controlling area of the adhesive such that the additional cost is not material can only be said to suggest use of the minutest amounts of material. Kaisumi and Odagiri are basically irrelevant to the present invention as they have nothing to do with controlling the unwinding of a roll to prevent waste and stabilize the dimensions of the roll and/or prevent collapse of the center hole in the case of coreless tissue. Accordingly they do nothing to remedy the deficiencies of Schroeder.

PATENT  
Customer No. 31743  
Attorney Docket No. 20186 (440 PCT)

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fees be charged to Deposit Account No. 10-0235.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: December 6, 2007

Robert S. Alexander  
Registration No. 28,359  
Georgia-Pacific LLC  
P. O. Box 899  
Neenah, WI 54957-0899  
(920) 729-8360